

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP  
San Jose, California

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 04 2007

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 30, 2007  
TO: Examiner Fikremariam Yalew; Tel. 571.272.3852; Fax. 571.273.8300  
FROM: Karl Rees; Tel. 408-414-1233; Fax 408-414-1076  
SUBJECT: U.S. Patent Application No. 10/618,127 (Domnety et al.)  
Attorney Docket No. 50325-0779  
3<sup>rd</sup> Office Action (Non-Final)

**Agenda for Telephone Interview on December 17, 2007, at 3 P.M. (EST)**

- I. Discuss Claims 1, 2, and 10
- II. Discuss ¶¶ [0033], [0039-40] of the specification
- III. Discuss *Sharma*
- IV. Discuss differences between the claimed invention and *Sharma*—

Claim 2 clarifies that a subsystem is determined to be authorized **only if it is a certain type of subsystem** (e.g. a DHCP server, NAT server, or AAA server). It is not possible to determine the type of a subsystem using, as *Sharma* teaches, just the IP address or MAC address of the subsystem. The IP addresses and MAC addresses are assigned independent of the subsystem type. *See also* Claims 7 and 8, as well as the steps outlined in ¶ [0039]-[0040] of the specification, which steps would be entirely redundant if the determination of a subsystem type in Claim 2 were based solely on the IP address and MAC address of the subsystem.

- V. Discuss possible amendments to Claim 1 that clarify these differences:
  - a. “wherein determining that a particular subsystem is authorized comprises determining that the particular subsystem is of a specified type.”
  - b. “wherein determining that a particular subsystem is authorized comprises determining that the particular subsystem is a DHCP server, AAA server, or NAT server.”
  - c. “wherein determining that a particular subsystem is authorized is based at least on factors other than the IP address and MAC address of the subsystem.”
- VI. Discuss Claim 14
- VII. Discuss *Chien*
- VIII. Differences between *Chien* and Claim 14—

*Chien* only discloses using routine information from a DHCP message (the ‘chaddr’ and ‘yiaddr’ fields) to update the ARP table. *See Chien* at ¶ [0064]. By contrast, Claim 14 requires receiving a request to update the ARP table in a DHCP message. Such a request is not routinely included in DHCP messages. Therefore, *Chien* does not disclose “receiving a request to update the ARP table . . . in a DHCP message.”